

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **June 2, 2004** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-34. Claims 1-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-5, 7-15, and 17-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jones (USPN 5,684,984, hereinafter "Jones"). Claims 6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-34 were rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 to remove the rejected limitations.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 were rejected as being anticipated by Jones. Applicant respectfully points out that Jones teaches distributing change information **at a set time or on demand** (see Jones, col. 4, lines 7-14). Additionally, Jones teaches initiating a new connection to send changes to a central service via a dial-up connection using a specified telephone number (see Jones, col. 4, lines 20-22).

In contrast, the present invention sends changes to a second system **upon detecting that the object has been changed** without the first system having to initiate a new connection with the second system (see FIG. 3, block 309 and page 7, lines 23-28 of the instant application). This is advantageous because it ensures that the second system is brought up-to-date immediately, without having to wait for the set time or make a demand for the update and without having to establish a new connection with the second system.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 to clarify that the present invention sends changes to a second system upon detecting that the object has been changed without the first system having to initiate a new connection with the second system. These amendments find support in FIG. 3, block 309 and on page 7, lines 23-28 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-11, which depend upon claim 1, claims 13-20, which depend upon claim 12, claims 22-27, which depend upon claim 21, and claims 29-31, which depend upon claim 28, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: July 14, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665